

CODEBOOK: Identifying and Classifying Rationalizations/Justifications

1 Rationalization/Justification Category Descriptions

We identified and classified any motivation or rationalization in favor of internment expressed by a British or N.Ireland government official found within the archive material (1969-74). A rationalization for internment included any explicit or implicit motivation, justification, legal pretext or argument in support of internment. We then classified each rationalization for internment into one or more of the following categories:

- **Emergency Situation:** Dismissal of “ordinary” law (e.g., due process protections) when facing exceptional security challenges
- **Legal authorizations:** Use of or deferral to existing emergency policies (e.g., that allow internment) as legally permissible or legitimate
- **Terrorism:** Commitments to contain/intern politically motivated terrorist “enemies of the state” or other extremists
- **Political motivations/concessions:** Perception that internment is advantageous for an actor’s political aims
- **Law and order:** Use of internment to maintain peace, law and order, social control
- **Denial:** Denial that internment violates liberal legal principles or human rights protections
- **International or domestic precedent:** Reference to other foreign, international or domestic standards, precedents, parallels, or comparisons to support internment
- **Utilitarianism or deterrence:** Perception that internment will deter violence and/or that its harms are relatively minimal, relative to its advantages
- **Development and unity:** Assertions that internment could quell the conflict that undermines economic development and social unity
- **Miscellaneous:** Internment will yield military gains (including generating intelligence); is a last resort; any other logic to rationalize internment

2 Rationalization/Justification Summary Tables

Table 1: **Final** rationalization/justification summaries (updated after pilot coding round)

	Main Intent (Not Exhaustive)	Main Codes	Not Captured
Emergency Policy	Internment is rationalized because of the present status quo of an extraordinary/exceptional security crisis, which requires extraordinary actions to combat it. The security situation necessitates internment.	Reference to “ security ” (public security, security situation, etc.), reference to emergency situation, need to overcome/overstep ordinary actions/order.	Comparison of extra/ordinary legal orders, use of law to authorize actions, military tactic/benefit, status quo of order.
Legal Procedure	Internment is rationalized because it is legally authorized and permissible. This rationalization contains the use or invocation of law, legal order, legal provisions, or new legal institutions to authorize internment.	SPA, comparison of extra/ordinary legal orders, internment is lawful, use of law, establishment of legal bodies/acts to permit internment (Em. Prov. Act, Advisory/Appeals Committee).	“Ordinary” legal proceedings, internee rights, logistics (meetings to discuss new procedures), etc.
Terrorism	Internment is rationalized because the state is working against terrorists/extremists.	Terrorist, terrorism, extremist, extremism.	General use of the word terrorism (not related to internment), lack of explicit description of terrorism, etc.
Political Strategy	Internment is rationalized because it is politically advantageous or due to political considerations.	Internment initiated alongside bans on marches and rifle clubs, interning along neutral and non-discriminatory lines, demands from Protestants.	Administrative/logistical negotiations, internal political negotiations about internment, etc.
Law & Order	Internment is rationalized because it will contribute to a return to a status quo of order/peace/stability.	Maintaining order/peace, returning peace/order, public order/safety, private property maintenance.	Not about large-scale threats to security.
Denial	Internment is rationalized because it’s not that bad. The state isn’t really violating domestic/international law/human rights standards.	Detainees have rights , detainees’ rights are provided for, rejection of claims that rights are being violated, etc.	Investigations into HR abuse, establishment of bodies/acts to establish legal procedures that don’t explicitly name/reference internees rights .
Intl/Domestic Precedent	Internment is rationalized because others (regimes, domestically or internationally) have enacted internment policies	Comparing NI internment to internment/similar policies implemented elsewhere, hopes or expectations that the Republic of Ireland will similarly carry out internment.	
Deterrence/Utility (violence)	Internment is rationalized because if we didn’t intern, then X (violent) outcome would occur. X can be: violence, violence against state actors/civilians, worse outcomes for those detainees.	An explicit or implicit comparison of internment to some other violent outcome (e.g., if we released internees, there would be/is more violence, internment is better than murder, etc.). Internment reduces violence.	Not a comparison of non-violent/general actions (e.g., “IRA activity”), not comparing to a violent outcome due to military necessity.
Development/Unity	Internment is rationalized because it will contribute to economic or societal goals in the long-term.	Improved community relations, improve political processes, bring an end to violence to allow for future goals.	Not just about the long-term goal of reducing violence.
Misc.	Internment is rationalized for another reason. Common: Internment is rationalized because: it is military effective or advantageous; it is inevitable or the only/best option; it is necessary despite costs; it is Stormont’s call; it isn’t and we are using a cover story; other.	Internment to gain intelligence, internment is short term/necessary/succeeding.	Not about the gains/intelligence gained from interrogation, torture, or questioning.

We thank Danielle Villa for assisting in the development of this table.

Table 2: **Preliminary** rationalization/justification summaries (developed prior to pilot coding round)

Code name	Description	Example (*hypothetical) / Notes
Rationalizations for internment		
“Law and order”	State actors will acknowledge that the State must maintain peace, social control, and order, and must ensure that citizens abide by the law. State agents assert that internment will contribute to this state objective. <i>Underlying idea:</i> Enforcing the law requires violence.	IRA operatives are disrupting law and order, and we need to adopt policies to prevent that behavior.* OR Because members of the IRA has violated the law and/or caused social unrest, IRA affiliates need to be interned or contained.*
Emergency policy	State actors argue that they are in an emergency circumstance that requires the exceptional responses (e.g., internment) authorized by the SPA. <i>Underlying Idea:</i> The letter of the law is above human rights principles.	“The ordinary law cannot deal comprehensively or quickly enough with such ruthless viciousness” (2162). <i>Any reference to “emergency circumstances” receives this code.</i>
Terrorism	State actors indicate a belief that certain subjects (e.g., those characterized as terrorist “enemies of the state,” those racialized as foreign “others,” or those who violate the law) are not afforded legal protections because they represent a threat or challenge to the state. References to actors who do not abide by the law also receive this code. <i>Underlying Idea:</i> Certain citizens are not entitled to—or have surrendered their entitlement to—rights-based perspectives.	The terrorists surrendered the privilege of being protected by liberal law.* <i>Any justification that references “terrorists” or “terrorism” receives this code.</i> <i>Possible overlap with Emergency policy justification:</i> Terrorists who threaten the sovereignty of the state represent an emergency circumstance that merits internment.*
Development/Unity	State actors justify internment as critical for achieving long-term social goals in Northern Ireland, including economic development, social development, or the creation of social unity.	
Political/strategic	State actors will justify their practices based on political or strategic interests, including: a) acquiescing to demands from the Protestant majority, b) silencing, containing, or weakening nationalist political opponents, or c) currying favor with other state colleagues who advocate for these practices.	The Protestants in N.Ireland demand strong action against the IRA.*
Utilitarian/deterrence	State actors argue that limited state use of violence (e.g., internment) either a) is minimal relative to the harm violent actors have caused (utilitarian); b) deters widespread, un-contained future violence (deterrence); or c) is less harmful than the potential violence actors could encounter on the street (scale).	The harm caused by internment is minor relative to the harms IRA have caused;* OR Being interned is preferable to being shot in a street-based shoot-out.*
“Last-resort”	State actors support internment only if it is considered the last available option; all other (less drastic) approaches have been exhausted without achieving desired outcomes.	I have said that I only support internment if [XX] policy was unsuccessful at quelling the unrest.*
Precedent	State actors identify international standards, precedents, parallels, or comparisons to justify internment.	Ex: Evidence of UK officials trying to convince Ireland to also adopt internment policies.*
Denial	State actors deny that their internment practices violate domestic law or international human rights norms. Discussion of rights that are afforded to interned/detained individuals receives this code.	References to abiding by rights of detainees.
Miscellaneous	A justification for internment is used that does not fit any of the above categories.	
Other internment-related dynamics		
Public rationalization	This code will accompany substantive justification code(s) when a justification was made publicly.	Ex: A justification that appears in an official’s public address about internment.
Euphemism	State actor makes an euphemistic reference to internment.	Ex: Reference to “detention” rather than “internment.”

Government control info	State actor or policy indicates a government effort or desire to keep secret, control, limit, constrain, prevent, misinform, or redirect public knowledge about internment.	<i>Coded at the sentence level, which provides greater specificity than the Round 1 code. Code limited to direct, substantive evidence of government control over information. Document classifications (e.g., Top Secret) do not alone merit this code.</i>
Oppose internment	Actor opposes or questions the merits of internment on any grounds. <i>Note:</i> This may include justifications and/or ideological ideas motivating actors' opposition to internment, or it may simply be evidence of opposition without a justification.	Human rights violations are not justifiable and/or represent democratic erosion; internment will increase violence; internment will attract international critique and/or harm Britain's global reputation.
Debate or hesitation	Evidence of deliberation, debate, disagreement, or hesitation about internment policies.	
Policymaking process	Document contains information that directly demonstrates the policy-making process. This code will aid Round 3 of our analysis.	<i>Code assigned at the document level.</i>
<i>All codes (with the exception of "Policymaking process") made at the phrase-, sentence-, or paragraph-level, as appropriate.</i>		

3 Guidelines for identifying a rationalization/justification (Y/N)

A rationalization refers to any explicit or implicit justification, rationalization, motivation, explanation, validation, legitimation, acknowledgment of legal permissibility, or argument in support of internment. Rationalizations for internment include ideas that A) support initially implementing internment, B) support continuing internment (indefinitely or until circumstances change), or C) support reducing or ending internment *if this includes an idea that supports the use of internment in theory*. This includes discussion of any legal, political, or military idea that authorizes internment or the idea that internment would fix a given problem or should have fixed a given problem. We cast the net for what we consider to be a rationalization widely. We are interested in British government rationalizations for internment (including the UK and Northern Ireland leaders, policymakers, or politicians). Do not code arguments for/against internment made by activists, Taoiseach Lynch or the Republic of Ireland, or anyone else not part of the NI / UK government. When a government official relays a third-party perspective that supports internment, we read that as their way of rationalizing internment.

Coding Sentences

- We are interested in rationalizations for **internment**. Do not code rationalizations for interrogation or other human rights abuses.
- Whenever possible, rationalizations should be coded at the sentence level. If a page begins mid-sentence, read the start of the sentence from the previous page to gain context. If the sentence contains a rationalization, code the sentence fragment.
- If a sentence includes bullet points or outlines that are not complete sentences, code it all as one sentence. If bullet points or outlines contain complete sentences on their own, code them as independence sentences. If only a subset of bullet points are related to internment and they occur in the middle/end of the bullet list (rather than the beginning), code only the bullet points.
- A given sentence may include multiple rationalizations if it either: A) captures a concept that overlaps between two categories (e.g., “Internment is necessary to keep terrorists from undermining our security” receives two codes: Terrorism and Emergency Policy); or B) captures two distinct concepts in the same sentence (e.g., “Protestants demand internment, and it will also ensure social unity” receives two codes: Political Strategic and Development / Unity.) If a rationalization sentence is accompanied by a data table or list, code the sentence but not the entire data list.
- If a sentence is a rationalization for internment because of what is said in the most immediate previous sentence, code the two as a block. When an immediately previous or subsequent sentence directly speaks to, and provides additional context for, an identified rationalization (and therefore can be considered broadly a part of that rationalization), it should be included in the coding of that rationalization. Also, if an immediately previous or subsequent sentence helps demonstrate that the rationalization sentence is in reference to internment, it should be coded along with the “obvious” sentence. However, if a relevant sentence appears not immediately before or after the “obvious” rationalization sentence, only code the “obvious” sentence (to

avoid capturing noise in between the two sentences).

- **Arrests:** References to arrest(s) without any more information: Assume this is not relevant to internment/detention. References to arrest that include discussions of the SPA or Emergency Provisions Act, internees/detainees, arrests without evidence or insufficient evidence for court of law: Consider this relevant to internment.
- We include as a rationalization discussion of the need to craft new institutions or to rearrange existing institutions (e.g., legal committees or proceedings, prisons, etc.) in order to accommodate internment for a specific purpose.

Do NOT code:

- References to ill-treatment **after** arrest; references to ill-treatment *during* arrests can be considered part of the internment process.
- References to interrogation, violent, or humiliating treatment experienced by internees. Only code references to interrogation when detainees/internees writ large are also referenced.
- Announcements about the release of internees, unless accompanied by a rationalization for having implemented internment explicitly or implicitly. References to releasing prisoners that do not contain a logic FOR internment should not be coded. Reference to releasing prisoners with a logic for internment build in **should** be coded w that logic (e.g., “The security situation is better so we will release prisoners” should receive the Emergency Policy code). A simple statement, “We are releasing internees” does not, in and of itself, represent a rationalization for internment.
- Arguments for/against internment made by activists, Taoiseach Lynch or the Republic of Ireland, or anyone else not part of the NI / UK government.
- Consideration about parties’ participation in political negotiations, given that internment is going on.
- Discussions about protests of internment.
- Rationalizations for *alternatives* to internment/detention.

4 Category-Specific Coding Guidelines

4.1 Rationalization Category: **Emergency Situation** (Emergency Policy)

This category is more aptly named “**Emergency Security Situation.**” State actors suggest or imply that Northern Ireland faces emergency circumstances and/or exceptional security challenges that require exceptional responses (e.g., internment). The underlying logic is that the dire security situation requires actions that would not otherwise be legally allowable or politically viable. Rationalizations that receive this code represent two distinct concepts:

1. The exceptional emergency security situation merits/requires actions that are drastic, exceptional, or would ordinarily be illegal, including the use of internment.
2. “Ordinary” law is insufficient for addressing threats to security during exceptional times.

Any explicit/implicit reference to the **security situation** necessitating, rationalizing, or justifying internment receives this code.

Examples/Concepts/References that should receive this code:

- Internment is necessary to respond to the **security situation**.
- **Security situation**, internment for “security” purposes, public security
- Extraordinary/exceptional situation necessitating internment
- People responsible for perpetrating violence
- Emergency situation requires government to take extra-legal action
- Need to contain those who are: part of an inner-circle, particularly violent, or particularly involved in the conflict
- Security forces must take action without fearing the legality of their actions
- *Negation*: Reducing internment because security situation has improved
- Extraordinary environment / emergency situation is undermining the ability to uphold ordinary legal procedures and ordinary participation in legal procedures
- Need to contain those for whom there is no evidence that would stand up in “ordinary” courts
- Ordinary court hearings would introduce security issues (including participant intimidation), given the current security situation (e.g., “Normal processes of investigation, detection, and trial were obstructed by a wall of silence”).
- Following “normal” court procedures would not work in this situation
- EX: “*Internment was the natural progression of a campaign which had failed to defeat the rebels when acting within the limits of civil law as it existed then*” (2191).

DO NOT code references to the following with “Emergency Policy”:

- Explicit military advantages, motivations, wins, influences (Code: Misc)
- Released internees who have facilitated violence (Code: Utilitarian/Deterrance).

Table 3: Coding Distinctions: Emergency Policy

TERRORISM: **Terrorism** can be considered a subset of **Emergency Policy**. The presence of terrorists implies the emergency situation that requires exceptional action.

IF: Terrorism/terrorists/extremism/extremists are referenced alongside discussion of the security/emergency situation	CODE: Emergency Policy, Terrorism
IF: Terrorism/terrorists/extremism/extremists are referenced with no mention of the security situation	CODE: Terrorism
IF: Known violent actors (e.g., Provisionals) are referenced for undermining security, but there is no explicit mention of their violence and/or there is no reference to them as terrorists or perpetrating terrorism	CODE: Emergency Policy

LEGAL PROCEDURE: Whereas **Emergency Policy** refers to the **idea** that the security situation merits a departure from “ordinary” law, **Legal Procedure** captures the process of actors using or creating law/policy to authorize their actions (and drawing the lines between these two legal orders). For Legal Procedure, actors implicitly rationalize internment by pointing to, and invoking, the legal parameters that allow them to sidestep trial.

IF: We need to contain those who pose a security threat but for whom no court-admissible evidence exists.	CODE: Emergency Policy
IF: We have sufficient evidence to try X in a court of law, but Y must be interned.	CODE: Legal Procedure

MISC: **Miscellaneous** captures internment merited for military purposes. **Emergency Policy** is a more general concept that invokes a general idea/assumption of an emergency situation. **Miscellaneous** captures explicit military motivations/objectives.

IF: An explicit military agenda, change in military circumstances, or military objective (e.g., gathering intelligence) is named	CODE: Misc
IF: General or abstract reference to “security situation”	CODE: Emergency Policy

LAW AND ORDER: Distinction between **Law and Order** and **Emergency Policy** is largely one of scale. **Law and order** refers to individuals or transgressions that deviate from an existing orderly situation; a sentence **only** receives this code when it contains an explicit reference to the concept of law, order, maintaining peace, or protecting property. **Emergency Policy** emphasizes a broader, more significant, more structural public instability/insecurity. Keywords can help guide these distinctions.

IF: Discussion of internment to ensure or return to law and order, public order, rule of law	CODE: Law and Order.
IF: Internment for the purposes of “restoring stability”	CODE: Emergency Policy
IF: Internment to hold individual law-breakers accountable	CODE: Law and Order
KEYWORDS: Public order, law and order, protect/restore peace, protect private property	CODE: Law and Order
KEYWORDS: (in)security, (in)stability, security situation, violence	CODE: Emergency Policy

4.2 Rationalization Category: **Legal Authorization** (Legal Procedure)

This category is more aptly named “**Emergency Legal Authorization.**” State actors focus on what is (or is not) allowed under emergency legal provisions like the **Special Powers Act (SPA)** or the subsequent **Emergency Provisions Act**, without necessarily regarding the substantive merits of those policies. Actors implicitly rationalize internment by asserting its legal permissibility and/or legitimacy. The state may do so by pointing to, and invoking, the legal parameters that allow the state to sidestep trial (e.g., the SPA)

and/or by adopting or building/drafting legal procedures that reflect those used under ordinary law (e.g., the Appeals Committee). Rationalizations that receive this code represent two distinct concepts:

1. Internment policies are acceptable because they are authorized by Northern Ireland’s existing emergency law (e.g., the SPA).
2. HMG is establishing legal procedures/institutions around its internment policies that are reminiscent of “ordinary” legal principles (e.g., the Advisory Committee)

Any reference to internment arrests made under **SPA regulations** receives this code.

Examples/concepts/references that should receive this code:

- Arrests authorized by the SPA (e.g., “X was interned under SPA 11”), detentions or arrests made under the SPA, or allegations of mistreatment during arrests made under the SPA.
- Assertions that internment is lawful and/or legally authorized
- Use of law/legal procedures to increase control over internees or detainees
- Performance of legal proceedings for internees (e.g., Advisory Committee appeals)
- Assertion that not all legal proceedings must necessarily be upheld for internees
- Consideration of legal procedural requirements under SPA and/or other “emergency” regulations
- Advocating for laws, procedures, or committees that expand or legitimate the state’s ability to arrest/intern/detain (e.g., The Advisory Committee). *Do not code logistical/secretarial discussions about setting up these procedures.*
- Efforts to ensure that internment procedures align with “ordinary” law’s procedural standards (e.g., fair, timely resolution)
- Delineating between “ordinary” and “emergency” law (e.g., people for whom they have sufficient evidence that would stand up in the court of law v. known state adversaries for whom they do not have court-admissible evidence)
- Joint Security Committee in Northern Ireland

DO NOT code references to the following under “Legal Procedure”:

- “Ordinary” legal proceedings when **not** juxtaposed with discussion of “emergency” legal proceedings (i.e., if a person is arrested under ordinary criminal proceedings).
- Legal sanctions not directly related to internment
- Logistical/secretarial discussions about setting up internment-related procedures, courts, or committees
- Reference to internment orders without discussion of the laws/regulations that authorize those orders.

Table 4: Coding Distinctions: Legal Procedure

DENIAL: **Denial** contains a direct claim that internees’ rights are being protected and/or that internees are not being wrongfully treated under the implementation of internment procedures.

IF: The internee will have the right to appeal through a special court.	CODE: Denial
IF: We are establishing a special court to process internment proceedings.	CODE: Legal Procedure
EMERGENCY POLICY (see above)	

4.3 Rationalization Category: **Terrorism**

State actors refer to those who are interned or those who are targeted for internment as terrorists/extremists, or state actors discuss the need for internment alongside the need to address terrorism or extremism. As a subset of “Emergency Policy,” the underlying idea is that those deemed “terrorists” cause exceptional security situations and therefore introduce the need for exceptional state responses (e.g., internment) to the dire security situation their terrorist threats cause.

Any reference to **terrorism** that explicitly/implicitly supports internment receives this code (e.g., “We are interning terrorists” or “Those interned are terrorists.”). **DO NOT code** references to Terrorism not specifically related to internment.

Distinctions from other categories: EMERGENCY POLICY (see above)

4.4 Rationalization Category: **Political** (Motivations or Concessions)

This category is more aptly named “**Political Motivations and Concessions.**” State actors will advance/support internment based on political interests/calculations or alongside concessions across the sectarian divide. These calculations or concessions include: a) acquiescing to demands from the Protestant majority; b) silencing, containing, or weakening political opponents (e.g., Republican nationalists); c) announcing/implementing internment in a way that claims to appear neutral across sectarian divides (e.g., banning rallies or rifle clubs; claiming that internment will be initiated against both Catholics and Republicans).

Any reference to people **demanding internment** or reference to **bans on marches/rifle clubs** alongside initiating internment receives this code.

Examples/concepts/references that should receive this code:

- Demands from Protestants
- Internment initiated alongside bans on marches and rifle clubs
- Claims that internment is not initiated in a discriminatory way (e.g., Catholics v. Protestants). *Note:* In the earliest stage of the coding process, we mis-coded a reference like this as “Denial” (DEFE 24 1214). However, we updated this approach after the first file we coded. A reference like this should be coded as Political Strategic, given the public context in which this assertion is made.

DO NOT code references to:

- Political considerations/negotiations not directly related to internment
- Internal political negotiations/processes about the implementation of internment

4.5 Rationalization Category: **Law and Order**

State actors will acknowledge that the state must maintain peace, social control, and order, and that the state must ensure that citizens abide by the law. State agents assert that internment will contribute to this state objective. This category most appropriately captures the idea that certain “bad apple” individuals fail to abide by the state’s existing laws and/or by the established orderly behavior that otherwise exists. In other words, select individual deviants are compromising the existing “rule of law.” The state must therefore intern those individual perpetrators in order to maintain or to re-establish “law and order” in Northern Ireland. “Law and Order” is distinguishable from “Emergency Policy” by the scale of deterioration of the rule of law and the security situation implied. Whereas “Law and order” suggests a few bad apples undermining law, order, and private property protections, “Emergency Policy” suggests a more systemic state of emergency. The substantive difference between this and the “emergency” code is one of a difference of the scale of the deterioration of the rule of law: relative order (law and order) vs. general chaos (emergency policy); e.g.,

if someone threatens security, that represents a higher-order threat than someone who threatens law and order.

References to internment in the name of preserving law, public order, public safety, or private property should receive this code. One of these ideas/concepts must be explicitly referenced for a sentence to receive this code.

Examples/concepts/references that should receive this code:

- Internment within the context of law and order, order on the ground, public peace
- Ensure/return law and order to our streets
- Protect life and security of property
- Preserve peace and maintain order
- EX: *“I (Name) (Appointment), an officer of the Royal Ulster Constabulary, hereby authorize you, for the preservation of peace and the maintenance of order, to arrest without warrant those named (below).”*

DO NOT code references to the following under this code:

- Internment needed to respond to, establish, or maintain **security**. (Code: Emergency policy)
- Oaths required of internees as a condition of release; particularly oaths to not engage in “unlawful activity.” (This is not coded.)

Table 5: Coding Distinctions: Law and Order

EMERGENCY POLICY (see above)

LEGAL PROCEDURE: **Legal Procedure** refers to how state officials legally authorize or legitimate internment (through using existing legal frameworks and/or through establishing procedural practices that appear to protect internees). On the other hand, **Law and Order** refers to the need to contain those who compromise peace and order on the streets. Although their names are similar, these categories are quite distinct from one another.

4.6 Rationalization Category: **Denial**

This category is more aptly named “**Human rights abuses downplayed.**” State actors deny that their internment practices violate domestic law or international human rights norms, they claim to honor or abide by internees’ rights, or they reject suggestions that internees had been mistreated or wrongfully arrested. This is an implicit rationalization for internment, because if internees have not had their rights violated, internment could be considered acceptable.

Reference to internees rights or to rights afforded to interned/detained individuals receive this code.

Examples/concepts/references that should receive this code:

- Rejection of claims that a person had been wrongfully arrested/interned
- References to abiding by the rights of detainees
- Government officials highlighting how they honor/abide by internees rights
- Committees or courts established to give internees **rights** to appeal.
- Claim that detention (under the Emergency Provisions Act) is a “far cry from internment”
- EX: Pope would have a more “favorable” view of detention once he understands their policies more fully (implies that the Pope would realize that human rights were not being abused).

DO NOT code references to:

- *Investigations* into allegations of rights abuses
- Examinations from doctors or other life-sustaining treatments in internment facilities

Table 6: Coding Distinctions: Denial

LEGAL PROCEDURE: **Denial** shares some conceptual overlap with **Legal Procedure**, which includes state actors emphasizing that they are abiding by legal parameters and therefore overlooking the legally tenuous nature of internment. The difference between these two is that, under the Denial category, state actors explicitly reference internee rights and/or imply that no rights are being violated.

IF: Advisory Committee will protect internee rights	CODE: Denial
IF: Advisory Committee is being established to hear cases	CODE: Legal Procedure

4.7 Rationalization Category: **International or Domestic Precedent**

State actors identify international or domestic standards, precedents, parallels, or comparisons to support their internment policies (including policies Britain adopted in British colonies). By pointing to existing examples from other places/contexts, state actors imply that internment is reasonable, defensible, or effective course of action.

Examples/concepts/references that should receive this code:

- HMG’s hope or expectation that the Republic of Ireland also initiate internment, and the belief that this will increase the effectiveness of internment in Northern Ireland
- Policies implemented by Britain in other domestic, colonial, or foreign contexts
- The retrospective idea that Northern Ireland’s internment policies would have been more politically palatable and/or strategically effective if the Republic of Ireland had also initiated the use of internment.

4.8 Rationalization Category: **Utilitarianism or Deterrence**

State actors argue that limited state use of violence (e.g., internment) either a) is minimal relative to the harm violent actors have caused (utilitarian); or b) deters widespread, un-contained future violence; or c) is less harmful to the person being interned than the potential violence actors could encounter on the street (scale). This code is specifically related to **violence**.

Examples/concepts/references that should receive this code:

- Idea that internees—had they not been interned or if they were to be released—would perpetrate violence
- Faulkner’s judgment that the consequences of internment would be more preferable than the consequences if internment was not imposed
- “Internment is a hideous step... but it is no more hideous than a campaign of murder”
- “Internment should properly be regarded not so much as an alternative to trial as an alternative to being shot in an act of terrorism.”
- Internment prevents the situation on the street from worsening.
- Internment will protect police, army, or civilians from violence or retaliation.
- Implication that there is an inverse relationship between internment and violence or evidence that this idea contributed to HMG’s decision to implement internment.

DO NOT code references to the following under this code:

- Deterring IRA activities if not specifically related to violence
- Any explicit reference to military motivations or agendas (Code: Misc)

Table 7: Coding Distinctions: Utilitarian / Deterrence

MISC: It is a little difficult to distinguish between the **Utilitarian/Deterrence** category and the **Misc** (Military effectiveness) category. If there is any reference to military or army interests or to accomplishing militarily advantageous tasks (e.g., gathering intelligence), this should be coded as “Misc.” The Utilitarian/Deterrence category refers to ideas about relative harm (utility) or preventing violence (deterrence) that is NOT directly attached to military objectives.

IF: Internment is militarily necessary	CODE: Misc
IF: Internment prevents the situation on the streets from worsening	CODE: Util/Deterrence.

EMERGENCY: It is also difficult to distinguish between the **Utilitarian/Deterrence** category and the **Emergency** category. If there is an explicit reference to a utilitarian or deterrence trade-off with internment, a sentence can receive this code. Otherwise, most references to the security situation or responding to violence should receive the Emergency Policy code.

4.9 Rationalization Category: **Development or Social Unity**

State actors rationalize internment as critical for achieving long-term economic or societal goals in Northern Ireland, including economic development, social development, or the creation/re-establishment of social unity.

Examples/concepts/references that should receive this code:

- Progress toward economic, social, or political goals
- Reductions in social animosity and/or improved social relations across populations; positive inter-community relations
- Internment will advance efforts to improve political processes (e.g., elections) or secure minority participation within the framework of a democratic government
- The belief/argument that economic, social, and cultural **progress** can be made once violence is brought to an end.

4.10 Rationalization Category: **Miscellaneous** (incl Military)

A rationalization for internment that does not fit any of the predefined categories. Several key themes are included in this category. Perhaps the most prominent among them is the idea that internment will produce some clear, tangible military gain or is merited for specific military purposes. Specifically, themes captured in “Misc” include:

1. **Internment is militarily effective or advantageous:** Internment is effective at generating intelligence; internment is militarily necessary to contain those who are perpetrating violence, undermining security, and/or causing the emergency situation; internment serves some direct military advantage; or internment incentivizes militarily desired behavior (e.g., a promise to release internees if violence de-escalates).

“IF THIS MOVE ENABLE US TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF TROOPS COMMITTED TO NORTHERN IRELAND EARLIER THAN WE COULD OTHERWISE HAVE DONE, THAT WILL BE A WELCOME CONSEQUENCE OF IT” (478-180).

“THE POLICE AND THE ARMY ARE FIRM IN THE VIEW THAT THE INTELLIGENCE THEY ARE NOW REAPING FROM THE INTERNMENT OPERATION MUST BE EXPLOITED TO THE FULL, AND USED IN A CONTINUING EFFORT TO ROLL UP THE IRA” (6194).

Table 8: Coding Distinctions: Misc

EMERGENCY POLICY: See above

UTILITARIAN/DETERRENCE: Misc captures militarily incentivizing behavior; Utilitarian/Deterrence captures reducing/preventing violence	
IF: Internment to incentivize behavior (e.g., Internees will be released if violence de-escalates)	CODE: Misc
IF: Internment will prevent violence (e.g., concern that releasing internees will increase violence)	CODE: Util/Deterrence

2. **Internment is inevitable, the only option, and/or better than any alternatives:** This represents a generalized assertion/justification/rationalization that is not accompanied by another concept. For example: Faulkner “had come to the conclusion that internment was now the right and indeed inevitable course” of action (2192).
3. **Internment is undesirable and/or violates human rights but is nevertheless necessary:** Here, an actor supports internment even while acknowledging that it is problematic or violates human rights. For examples: hopes that internment will be short-lived (2194), or: “I have exercised powers of internment with the greatest possible reluctance” (5589). **Distinct from DENIAL**, which emphasizes internment’s procedural protections (implying that rights are *not* being violated).
4. **Internment is ultimately Stormont’s decision:** Here, HMG defers responsibility for making the decision about internment to the government in Northern Ireland. For example, it indicates that “of course the decision is [Faulkner’s], though he has reached it after consultation with us” (2193, 2196, 2233).
5. **Cover story: Internment facilities will be used to house British Troops:** This represents a pre-internment discussion about needing a cover story for the government’s use of internment facilities that they are developing (as facilities to house British troops). They devise this cover story because “the real purpose of the accommodation must not be divulged in public” (2262). This should be considered a “rationalization,” because it obfuscates the need to offer a public rationalization for internment.
6. **Other rationalizations:** Rationalizing “preventative detention” to avoid the “taint of internment”; rationalizing not ending internment by pointing out that many individuals have been released or that doing so will not decrease violence; demonizing IRA legal advocates.

Code internment-related references to:

- **Intelligence;** gaining intelligence from detainees during the internment process (without specific reference to interrogation)
- Internment attached to the need for military successes
- Internment’s implicit appropriateness, value, or importance, in the absence of any other explicit rationalization
- Internment is only being implemented on a short-term basis
- Internment is necessary, inevitable, or essential (without being attached to the emergency security situation)
- Internment is “working” or “succeeding”; internment is helping disrupt, dismantle, or disorganize the IRA

DO NOT code references to rationalizations for interrogation as a source of intelligence.